



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,862	06/27/2006	Staffan Soderlund	464.1030USN	1474
33369 7590 06/24/2009 FASTH LAW OFFICES (ROLF FASTH) 26 PINECREST PLAZA, SUITE 2 SOUTHERN PINES, NC 28387-4301				
EXAMINER				
LIM, SENG HENG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,862

Applicant(s)

SODERLUND, STAFFAN

Examiner

SENG H. LIM

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/11/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/11/2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 8/25/2008 in which applicant amends claims 1 & 2; added claim 10; and responds to the claim rejections. Claims 1-10 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/11/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 are in view of new amendments and added limitations. Please refer to bolded section below for explanation regarding new amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant amended claim 1 to include moving a magnetic unit on top of the playing area in an x-direction toward "a goal area of a the first player" when the brain wave frequency of the first player is between 3-12 Hz. Applicant originally claimed the magnetic unit moves toward the second player in the instant application. Applicant's new language can be interpreted to mean the magnetic unit is moved towards the first player own goal area, for which the applicant does not have support.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant claims the indication of mental state of the player; however, Applicant is only allow to measure brain wave frequency, not mental state of the players.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brotz (US 5,213,338) in view of Ohlschlager (US 3,712,617).

Re claim 1, 4, 5, 6, 8 & 9. Brotz discloses a method of playing a game for two players (Abstract) comprising providing the two players each with a sensor (24 & 26; Fig. 2) for measuring brain wave intensity (4:6-35). Two players are seated opposite each other at the short sides of the playing area trying to move a game unit or illuminating square from their own side of the playing area to the other side (7:9-22). Whoever moves the gaming unit adjacent or to opponent's side of the playing area first wins. Brotz also discloses a game wherein the measured difference between two player's brainwave intensity is compared to move a game unit wherein the game unit is moved or rotated in the direction of the player producing the more intense brainwaves (claim 6).

Brotz does not disclose rolling a magnetic unit (i.e. ball) on top of the playing area in x or y direction; however, Ohlschlager discloses moving a ball through a maze by magnets under control of multiple players in x and y direction (Abstract). At the time of invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify Brotz's method of rotating a playing area with Ohlschlager's method of rotating a playing area to move a magnetic ball through a maze and would have been motivated to do so to provide player enjoyment of a puzzle game.

Brotz does not necessarily equate intensity with frequency; however Brotz specifically says that the invention can be used for relaxation (Col 1, 39-41). A player can only achieve a relaxed state when his brain wave frequency is lowered. Clearly, Brotz teaches a game wherein the player with the lower brain wave frequency will win, if the motive of the game is to help the players reach a relaxed state of mind.

Re claim 2, 10. Brotz discloses floating the unit (202: Fig. 15) a constant distance (D) over the playing area (203: Fig. 15).

Re claim 3. Brotz discloses measuring theta wave, alpha wave and beta wave frequencies of the brains of the player (4:13-14).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brotz (US 5,213,338) and Ohlschlager (US 3,712,617).as applied to claim 1 and further in view of McCaslin (US 4,332,385).

Brotz and Ohlschlager teach the invention substantially as claimed, but do not expressly disclose a method wherein a player loses the game by moving the game unit over a recess or losing direction. McCaslin discloses a method wherein a player loses the game by moving the game unit over a recess or losing direction (3:34-36). At the time of invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify Brotz and Ohlschlager's method to include a recess or losing direction to make the game more challenging.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SENG H. LIM whose telephone number is (571)270-3301. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00, Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

Art Unit: 3714

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. H. L./

Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/Corbett Coburn/
Primary Examiner
AU 3714